

REMARKS

1. The Office Action has rejected Claims 2 – 4, 7 – 9, 12 and 18 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 4,911,296 (Hart). The Office Action states that Hart teaches a panel 64 having a resistance to penetration greater than the remaining portions of the container. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants would direct the Examiner's attention to the amendments to Claims 2, 12 and 18 to specify that the front wall has a panel that is formed of a material that has a resistance to penetration greater than the material from which the rest of the body of the trunk organizer is formed. In independent Claim 18, the material of the reinforcement panel is specified as aramid fiber.

The Hart utility chest is formed with a panel 64 that is formed of a resilient foam lining to provide cushioning for any volatile items that might be stored in the foam-lined compartment. While this panel 64 may be of a different material than the remaining body of the utility chest, the resilient foam cannot be construed as a material that provides a resistance to penetration that is greater than the material from which the remainder of the compartment is formed. Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion within the Hart reference to form a reinforcement panel for the entire front wall of the utility chest, as is set forth in amended independent Claim 12, from a material different from the rest of the utility chest, as opposed to the lining of a compartment as is taught in Hart, let alone from a penetration resistant material. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Hart reference cannot anticipate or make obvious the trunk organizer defined in amended independent Claims 2, 12 and 18.

In view of these amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

2. The Office Action has rejected Claims 2 – 5, 7 – 9, 12 and 14 – 18 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over, U. S. Patent No. 3,390,810 (Schneeweis), or U. S. Patent No. 4,757,938 (Collins). The Office Action states that these references provide a teaching of an increased penetration resistant front wall of a trunk organizer due to the double thickness of the material from which the compartments were formed. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants would again direct the Examiner's attention to the amendments to Claims 2, 12 and 18 to specify that the front wall has a panel that is formed of a material that has a resistance to penetration greater than the material from which the rest of the body of the trunk organizer is formed. In independent Claim 18, the material of the reinforcement panel is specified as aramid fiber.

Neither the Schneeweis nor Collins references contain any teaching or suggestion for forming the front wall with a reinforcement panel made from a material that is different than the material from which the rest of the container is constructed, let alone a material that has a penetration resistance quality greater than the material from which the rest of the container is formed. Furthermore, neither Schneeweis nor Collins contain any teaching or suggestion whatsoever for adding to the front wall of the carrying case a reinforcement panel formed of a penetration resistant material with the specific purpose of preventing objects from penetrating the along substantially the entire transverse dimension of the front wall of claimed trunk organizer.

In view of the amendments made above, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

3. The Office Action has rejected Claims 2 – 5, 7 – 9, 12 and 14 – 18 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over, U. S. Patent No. 2,950,852 (Hutchison). The Office Action states that the frame 42 attached to the front wall provides an increased penetration resistance for the tote box. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants would again direct the Examiner's attention to the amendments to Claims 2, 12 and 18 to specify that the front wall has a panel that is formed of a material that has a resistance to penetration greater than the material from which the rest of the body of the trunk organizer is formed. In independent Claim 18, the material of the reinforcement panel is specified as aramid fiber.

As with the previous rejections, Hutchison contains no teaching or suggestion for forming the front wall with a reinforcement panel made from a material that is different than the material from which the rest of the container is constructed, let alone a material that has a penetration resistance quality greater than the material from which the rest of the container is formed. Furthermore, Hutchison does not contain any teaching or suggestion whatsoever for adding to the front wall of the carrying case a reinforcement panel formed of a penetration resistant material with the specific purpose of preventing objects from penetrating the along substantially the entire transverse dimension of the front wall of claimed trunk organizer.

In view of the amendments made above, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

4. The Office Action has rejected Claim 6 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U. S. Patent No. 4,757,938 (Collins) in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,699,959 (Huspeka). The Office Action states that Huspeka teaches the formation of a lid on a carton using a separate recessed lid. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Huspeka contains no teaching or suggestion relating to the formation of a reinforcement panel for the front wall of a trunk organizer from a penetration resistant material, which would meet the limitations of independent Claim 2 from which Claim 6 depends. Since Claim 6 contains the limitations of Claim 2 and adds structural limitations further defining Applicants' invention, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 6 should be passed to allowance with Claim 2.


For the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

5. Applicants appreciate the allowance of Claims 10, 13, 19 and 20. Applicants would prefer to retain these claims in their dependent form and request that they be passed to allowance with the respective independent claim from which they depend.

6. In summary, Claims 2, 12 and 18 have been amended and Claims 2 – 10 and 12 - 20 remain in the application. Applicants believe that the claims are allowable based on the foregoing amendments. Applicants respectfully request that all objections and rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn and that all claims remaining in this case be allowed.

Pursuant to currently recommended Patent Office practice, the Examiner is expressly authorized to call the undersigned attorney if in his judgment disposition of this application could be expedited or if he considers the case ready for final disposition by other than allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: April 10, 2006

Larry W. Miller, Reg. No. 29,417
Attorney for Applicant
Miller Law Group, PLLC
25 Stevens Avenue
West Lawn, PA 19609
Phone: 610-670-9000
Fax: 610-670-9901